

682. e. 24.
15

CHRIST THE GREATER GLORY OF THE TEMPLE.

A

S E R M O N

PREACHED BEFORE THE
UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD,
AT CHRIST-CHURCH,
ON SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 9, 1788.

BY BENJAMIN BLAYNEY, D.D.
REGIUS PROFESSOR OF HEBREW, AND CANON OF
CHRIST-CHURCH, OXFORD; AND RECTOR OF
POULSHOT, WILTS.

K

OXFORD:
PRINTED FOR D. PRINCE AND J. COOKE,
AND T. CADELL, LONDON.

M DCC LXXXVIII.

IMPRIMATUR,

JOHAN. COOKE,

Vice-Can. Oxon.

Dec^{bris}. 17^{mo}. 1788.

T O
THE MOST REVEREND FATHER IN GOD
J O H N
LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY,
PRIMATE AND METROPOLITAN OF
ALL ENGLAND.

M Y L O R D,

WHETHER the celebrated prophecy of Haggai has or has not any reference to the coming of Christ, hath for many ages been a disputed point among the professors of sacred criticism. Some have thought the allusion to the Messiah's advent so clearly and strongly marked in it, that they have on this ground warmly asserted the truth of their opinion, though without being able to solve all the difficulties with which it was embarrassed. Whilst others have controverted that opinion with no less earnestness, from a persuasion that those difficulties were wholly insurmountable, and of sufficient weight to invalidate every plausible appearance in its favour. It must however be acknowledged, that none of these opponents have substituted an interpretation of their
own

own, which has not been liable to still more and greater objections. If my attempt, which I have now the honour of submitting to your Grace and the Public, shall prove successful in removing those obstructions, which have hitherto prevented a clear and just apprehension of this prophecy, I shall rejoice in the advantage that will thence result to the christian cause ; as I shall also in the opportunity afforded me, with your Grace's kind permission, of publishing my gratitude for the many marks of favour I have received at your hands, but more particularly for the flattering distinction of having been recommended by your Grace, on your own voluntary motion, for the dignified station, which I have now the honour to fill in this University. Be pleased to accept the most grateful acknowledgments and respectful thanks of

M Y L O R D,

Your G R A C E's most dutiful

and obliged humble Servant,

CHRIST-CHURCH,

Dec. 12. 1788.

B E N J A M I N B L A Y N E Y.

HAGGAI II. 6, 7, 8, 9.

FOR THUS SAITH THE LORD OF HOSTS; YET ONCE, IT IS A LITTLE WHILE, AND I WILL SHAKE THE HEAVENS, AND THE EARTH, AND THE SEA, AND THE DRY LAND;

AND I WILL SHAKE ALL NATIONS, AND THE DESIRE OF ALL NATIONS SHALL COME: AND I WILL FILL THIS HOUSE WITH GLORY, SAITH THE LORD OF HOSTS.

THE SILVER IS MINE, AND THE GOLD IS MINE, SAITH THE LORD OF HOSTS.

THE GLORY OF THIS LATTER HOUSE SHALL BE GREATER THAN OF THE FORMER, SAITH THE LORD OF HOSTS: AND IN THIS PLACE WILL I GIVE PEACE, SAITH THE LORD OF HOSTS.

A VERY learned and ingenious person, in closing his remarks upon this prophecy, has given it as his opinion, that “the most plausible objections to the christian religion have been made out of the weak arguments, which have been advanced in its support^a.” And so far I heartily agree with him as to the general. But in his ap-

^a Dr. Heberden in Bishop Newcome’s excellent Commentary on the Minor Prophets. p. 171.

plication of the implied censure to the passage before us, which has commonly been understood to contain a direct prophecy of the Messiah's coming, I cannot but think him absolutely wrong. For "can there," says he, "be a weaker argument than that, which sets out with doing violence to the original text, in order to form a prophecy; and then contradicts the express testimony of the best historian of those times, in order to shew that it has been accomplished?"—It will, I trust, be matter of some satisfaction to this audience, and not less so to the respectable author of the preceding paragraphs, who is himself a warm and zealous advocate in the cause of revelation, if I am able to shew, that without any constrained interpretation of the original text, or injury to the credit of Josephus, the historian alluded to, the prophecy may, and must, be understood as directly pointing to the coming of Christ, and the future establishment of the evangelical dispensation.

The occasion upon which this prophecy was delivered was this. After a long interruption, which had been caused by the opposition made by the hostile neighbours of the Jews to the rebuilding of their temple, that people in the second year of Darius Hystaspes, at the instigation of God himself by the prophet Haggai, and under the direction of Zerubbabel their governor, and Joshua the high-priest, began once more to take in hand the prosecution of the work^c. It is not to be wondered at, if, in consideration of

^b Ibid.^c Haggai i.

the low and distressed circumstances they were in at that time, they should have despaired of raising the building to the same state of splendor and magnificence, in which it had been originally built by Solomon; and that this consideration should have excited melancholy thoughts and reflexions in the minds of those, who remembered it in its former glory. To remove these gloomy thoughts, which hung upon their spirits, and had a tendency to slacken their vigour in carrying forward the business in hand, was undoubtedly the immediate design of God's providence in acquainting them with a circumstance that otherwise could not have been known to them; which was, that the temple they were then building, notwithstanding the present unpromising appearances, should in time arrive at a higher degree of glory than that, which they were now disposed to consider as so much its superior. This at least is what has been generally agreed on^d; and the sole matter of question seems to have been, what were the circumstances which constituted the glory spoken of, and in what manner the prophecy had its accomplishment, whether by the influx of wealth, and the addition of costly ornaments of silver and gold, or by the still more glorious presence of the Messiah himself, and the blessings consequent upon his appearance.

It must be acknowledged, that to which side soever of the question we incline, the difficulties to be encountered

^d See Appendix, Note [A]

with wear at first view a formidable aspect. If by the glory we should understand the magnificence of the structure, or the rich and precious furniture with which the temple was decorated, there is little reason to believe, that the second temple, built under the direction of Zerubbabel, ever did arrive at an equal, much less a superior, degree of splendor to that of Solomon^c. Nay the contrary is evident, namely, that the second temple fell vastly short of the first both in largeness and height, and most probably in the richness of its ornaments; if we at all credit the speech which Herod is said to have made to the Jews, preparatory to his taking of it down in order to rebuild it; in which he states it to have been the main object he had in view, to restore it once again to its primary dimensions and grandeur^f. As to any additional wealth or splendor that might afterwards have accrued, when Herod had rebuilt the temple, and enlarged it, and expended immense sums on its decoration, all that, I conceive, must on the present footing of the question be set aside, as being wholly foreign to the account. For if Herod actually pulled down the old temple from its foundations, and erected a new one in its room, as he is said to have done^g, how glorious and splendid soever it were, it was no longer the temple which was built under Zerubbabel, and of which Haggai prophesied, but one as totally distinct from it, as that of Zerubbabel was from the temple of Solomon.

^c See Appendix, Note [B] ^f Ibid. Note [C] ^g Ibid. Note [D]

The glory then, which came not till Zerubbabel's temple was no more, could not in any wise be said to have distinguished that temple in preference to Solomon's, or indeed to any other. And it is this very consideration, which has furnished the principal objection against the common interpretation, which supposes the glory to respect the Messiah's advent. For the Messiah undoubtedly came not while the temple of Zerubbabel was standing; and consequently his presence could not have contributed at all to its glory. And therefore those, who are positive that the Messiah's coming was certainly intended in the prophecy, have many of them been led to question the veracity of Josephus as an historian, upon whose single testimony the truth of Herod's having wholly taken down the old temple, and built one entirely new, is thought to rest^h. For "if Josephus's relation "be true," say they, "the prophecy of Haggai could not "have had its accomplishment; and therefore Josephus "must have been a false historian, or Haggai a false prophet." An alarming alternative indeed! For it were hard to conceive that a writer of such approved excellence as Josephus would have invented and inserted in his history a falsehood, which must have been known to be such, and could so easily have been disproved, by many of his contemporaries. And for what purpose? To aggrandize the character of Herod,

^h See a Pamphlet intitled, EVIDENCE that the Relation of Josephus concerning Herod's having new built the Temple at Jerusalem is either false or misinterpreted. Oxford. MDCCCLXXXVIII.

it seems; a prince, whose memory, notwithstanding his benefactions, was held in no high estimation among the Author's countrymen the Jews, nor even among the Romans themselves, with whom the Author is supposed willing to ingratiate himself¹. But not to dwell on the absurdity of such a motive, besides the arguments which have been already produced by a very valuable member of this University in support of the history^k, let it be remembered, that in the Gospel itself we find a concurrent proof of the fact which Josephus has related. For when the Jews told our Saviour, that "their temple had been forty and six years in building^l," they manifestly referred back to the exact period of time, when Herod is said to have taken the building in hand^m.

But if the historian's narrative be true, does it therefore necessarily follow that the prophecy is false? There will not, I think, be found any such inconsistency between them, if we fairly examine the original text, which states no such opposition, according to my judgment, between the first and second temple, as implies the necessity of a falsehood on the one side, or on the other. For in the Hebrew the words will be found to stand precisely thus — "GREAT SHALL BE THE GLORY OF THIS HOUSE, THE LATTER MORE

¹ See Appendix, Note [E]

^k See an excellent Pamphlet intitled, REMARKS on Josephus's account of Herod's rebuilding the temple at Jerusalem, by T. BURGESS, A. M. Fellow of C. C. C. Oxford, &c. *Oxford* MDCCLXXXVIII.

^l John ii. 20.

^m See Appendix, Note [F]

THAN THE FORMER". So that the words LATTER and FORMER may as well be constructed with THE GLORY, as with THIS HOUSE. Accordingly the Seventy have actually adopted this construction, and render, THE LATTER GLORY OF THIS HOUSE SHALL BE GREATER THAN THE FORMER^o; and the context seems evidently to justify the propriety of their translation. For in the introductory part of this prophecy the word FIRST or FORMER is manifestly applied to GLORY, and not to THIS HOUSE. "Who is left among you, that saw this house in her FIRST GLORY? and how do ye see it now? Is it not in your eyes in comparison of it as nothing?" It is manifest too, that in this passage the term THIS HOUSE is not confined in its application to the house which the Jews were then building, but is undeniably meant of Solomon's temple. Nor indeed is it generally necessary to render a house identically the same, according to the common acceptation of language, that it be built at one and the same time, and exactly of the same form and materials; it is sufficient, though it should have been rebuilt at different times successively, if it be erected still on the same site, and devoted to the self same purpose. It is the house of God, the temple appropriated to divine worship at Jerusalem, which is intended by THIS HOUSE, whe-

" גדול יהיה כבוד הבית הזה האחרון מן הראשון.

^o See Appendix, Note [G]

^p Haggai ii. 3.

ther built by Solomon, by the Jews under Zerubbabel, or by Herod. In like manner as we usually speak of what has been transacted in the Church of ST. PAUL's at London, as well before its demolition, as since it has been rebuilt in its present splendor, as done in one and the same Church. Were it otherwise, how could Solomon's temple be called THIS HOUSE, as it is in the passage just now cited? Or how are we to understand the words (Ezra v. 11, 12, 13.) which the Jews are said to have spoken in answer to the Persian Officers, who demanded of them what authority they had for rebuilding their temple? "We are," say they, "the servants of the God of heaven and earth, and build THE HOUSE that was builded these many years ago, which a great king of Israel builded and set up. But after that our fathers had provoked the God of heaven unto wrath, he gave them into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Babylon, the Chaldean, who destroyed THIS HOUSE, and carried the people away into Babylon. But in the first year of Cyrus the king of Babylon, the same king Cyrus made a decree to build THIS HOUSE of God." Here it is plain, that the words THIS HOUSE are alternately applied to the temple of Solomon, and that built under Zerubbabel, and may certainly as well be extended to that of Herod. So that allowing the construction now brought forward, there remains no longer a contradiction between Josephus's history and the prophecy in question, whether we choose to understand

stand by THE GLORY the wealth and decorations introduced by Herod and those that followed after him, or the manifestation of the divine presence in the same temple by the Messiah's coming. Which of these two is to be preferred, is a point that may now, I think, be determined upon without much hesitation.

The terms of this prophecy are in themselves so clear and discriminate, so little liable to be mistaken, that hardly, I suppose, would there have been two opinions concerning its application, at least among those who were at all versed in the language of scripture, or had right notions of the nature and design of prophecy in general, had it not been for the intervention of the before-mentioned difficulty. It was this circumstance, no doubt, of its apparent inconsistency with the truth of history, which prejudiced the minds of very many learned and judicious inquirers against an interpretation the most obvious and natural that could be, and made them willing to accept of any other plausible construction of the words, how constrained soever, rather than admit of a sense, in which, according to their preconceived notions, they saw it impossible for the prophecy ever to have had its accomplishment. Had it not been for the influence of this prejudice, would the very respectable author of the remark cited at the beginning of this discourse^a have passed so severe a censure on those, who had thought themselves justified in

^a Pag. 1.

interpreting חמדה or חמדות, take which of the two you please, THE DESIRE OR DELIGHT, instead of THE PRECIOUS OR DESIRABLE THINGS, of all nations, as he would rather render it? I say חמדה or חמדות, take which ever of the two you like best; for it is certain, that both are equally applicable to a single person, though the latter perhaps with a signification somewhat more intense than the former, as is plain from the instance of Daniel, Ch. ix. 23. who is there stiled חמדות, in the plural, "One greatly beloved." Was not the Messiah the promised seed, of whom it was told, and that repeatedly, to Abraham, that "in him should "all the families, or nations, of the earth be blessed"? Was it not He, "to whom the gathering," or as it is in some versions, perhaps more properly, translated, "the expectation of the people should be"? Was he not declared "to be ordained for a light to the Gentiles, to minister salvation unto the ends of the earth"? And might he not then justly, and in a sense far above all others, be stiled OMNIUM GENTIUM DESIDERIUM ET DELICIÆ, "the desire and delight of all nations," even of those who antecedently knew him not, but were afterwards to enjoy the benefit of his appearance? And what could be more august, more majestically glorious than such an appearance? What was there that could so much contribute to the glory of the

* See Bp. Newcome on the Minor Prophets, Note, p. 168.

* Gen. xxii.

18. xxvi. 4. xxviii. 14.

* Gen. xlix. 10.

* Isai. xlix. 6.

temple,

temple, as the coming of Him, of whom the prophet Malachi likewise prophesied that "he should come to his temple, "the Lord whom ye seek," says he, "the Angel of the "covenant in whom ye delight, behold, he shall come, "saith the Lord of hosts"^w?" Then was the temple indeed filled with the glory of the Lord; then, and then only, did the latter glory of the house become greater than that which it had at the beginning. For we read, that when Solomon had finished his building, "the cloud filled the "house of the Lord, so that the priests could not stand to "minister because of the cloud; for the glory of the Lord "had filled the house of the Lord^x." This was the SHE-CHINAH, that glorious symbol of the divine presence, which visibly rested over the ark between the Cherubim, so long as the temple of Solomon was in being. But when that temple was destroyed by the Chaldeans, the cloud of glory was removed, and, as we learn, never afterwards deigned to revisit the house. And what could sufficiently compensate for its absence? Not all the splendor and magnificence, which the treasures of the whole earth could supply, supposing them still more abundantly greater than ever were actually brought for the decoration of the temple, could have made the glory of any future building, where this emblem of majesty was wanting, in any wise equal, much less superior to that which was derived from it. And therefore

^w Malachi iii. 1.^x 1 Kings viii. 10, 11.

it is certain, that by the accession of any such treasures the prophecy never could have had its accomplishment. But it was then fulfilled in its fullest scope and meaning, when instead of the symbol the house was irradiated with the actual presence of HIM, "who was the brightness of his Father's glory, and the express image of his person", and "in whom dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily". How poor, how mean and despicable, must all "the precious, the desirable things of the nations," THE SILVER AND THE GOLD, appear in the eyes of God at least, whatever they may do in the eyes of man? And therefore though he claimed the absolute property and dominion of these, so as to have them to bestow where he pleased, it was not with them that he meant to distinguish those who were destined to be the future objects of his favour^a. For them he had a far more valuable present in reserve, even the blessing of peace; for IN THIS PLACE, says he, WILL I GIVE PEACE. And most assuredly he gave it; but not that continuance of temporal peace and prosperity, which the Jews looked for from the Messiah's coming; nor yet that peace which others have chosen to understand by it, a peace of mind arising from the contemplation of God's returning care and providential regard for his people, discoverable in the renewed

^a Heb. i. 3.

^b Col. ii. 9. See Appendix, Note [H]

^c See Abp. Secker's note cited in Bishop Newcome's Appendix to his Commentary on the Minor Prophets, p. 241.

splendor

splendor of the place of his habitation among them ; for had that been intended, it must have proved in the end a very delusive and ill grounded peace and security ; since it was at the very time when the temple shone forth in its greatest lustre, that God was preparing to bring both upon it and them the most terrible and lasting destruction. Nor yet was it what the Seventy have added in their version as a part of the text, but which was most probably at first no more than a marginal explanation, in time brought into it accidentally and without authority, namely “ peace of soul
 “ for a possession to every one that laboureth in the building
 “ for the sake of restoring this temple^b ;” which were a very low and confined sense of the term PEACE, altogether unsuitable to the lofty style and gravity of the context. No ; but it was the GOSPEL OF PEACE^c, the reconciliation effected between God and Man by the remission of sins ; it was doubtless this that was intended, and was bestowed, when he, the very PRINCE OF PEACE^d, caused that gospel to be tendered to the acceptance of all nations, himself beginning to preach it in person at Jerusalem^e. And what shall we say of that “ shaking,” that universal commotion, announced in the beginning of this prophecy, which was to affect “ the
 “ heavens and the earth, and the sea, and the dry land, and

^b Καὶ ἐγένθη ψυχῆς εἰς περιποίησιν παντὶ τῷ κτιζοντι, τὴ ἀναστροφῇ τοῦ ναοῦ τούτου. LXX.

^c Luke ii. 14. Rom. x. 15. Eph. ii. 16, 17, 18.

^d Isai. ix. 6.

^e Matth. xxviii. 19. Mark xvi. 15. Luke xxiv. 47.

“ all

“all nations?” What else could be intended by it; but that thorough change and revolution which took place at the Messiah’s coming in the religious circumstances of the whole world, when the Jewish Dispensation, having fulfilled its course, was brought to an end, when the vail was rent, and all the other nations were called off from their various idolatries, and admitted all upon an equal footing to join in the pure and spiritual worship of the one only true and living God? Hath there been, can there be, a rational account given of any other convulsion in any degree adequate to the terms here made use of? But we are justified in applying it in the manner now mentioned by no less authority than that of the inspired writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews; who in comparing the Gospel Covenant with that of the Law, which also was introduced by God himself among the Jews with great solemnity, says, “Whose voice then “shook the earth,” namely, at the giving of the law; “but “now he hath promised, saying, Yet once more I shake not “the earth only, but also heaven. And this word, Yet once “more, signifieth the removing of those things that are shaken, as of things that are made,” or rather, that have been made and completed, “that those things which cannot “be shaken,” meaning the everlasting Gospel, “may remain.” — Thus clear, consistent and harmonious in all its parts doth this prophecy appear, and is discerned to

^f πρὸς Ἑβραίους.

^g Heb. 12. 26, 27.

be fully verified and accomplished by the coming of Christ, now that the impediment is removed, which cast a dark shade of confusion and perplexity around it. And if it is so much indebted for its illustration to the alteration I have ventured to make in the translation, doth not the illustration reflect back in turn a very strong presumptive proof of the propriety of the alteration ?

Allow me to add a short observation before I conclude ; which is, That as nothing can afford a stronger argument in favour of Christianity than its agreement with the testimony of the ancient prophets ; so the more perfectly the writings of those prophets are understood, the better ground shall we have for our belief in the truths of the Gospel. Let us then “ search the scriptures ” diligently, as our Saviour himself recommended, “ for they,” said he, “ are “ they which testify of me^b.” But in order to search them effectually, and study them with the best advantage, a competent knowledge of the language in which they were originally written is an indispensable qualification.

^b John v. 39.

to fully verified and accompanied by the name of China.
now the the importance of the subject is so great
that of conclusion and perhaps some of the
is to such indicated in the illustration to the illustration
have ventured to make in the illustration. But the
illustration itself back in some very interesting points
of the progress of the illustration.

Allow me to add a short observation before I conclude
which is. That as nothing is a good thing, it is
in favor of Christianity than its opponents. The
theory of the Christian religion, to the same extent
with the of these principles and understand the same
and we have for our basis in the world of the Gospel.

Let us then return to the subject of the Christian
and the Christian religion. The Christian religion
is a religion of love, and it is a religion of peace.
and I hope that with the best advantage, a
great knowledge of the Christian religion which they have

received from the Christian religion which they have

received from the Christian religion which they have

received from the Christian religion which they have

received from the Christian religion which they have

received from the Christian religion which they have

received from the Christian religion which they have

received from the Christian religion which they have

received from the Christian religion which they have

received from the Christian religion which they have

received from the Christian religion which they have

received from the Christian religion which they have

received from the Christian religion which they have

A P P E N D I X.

N O T E [A]

I Say, "generally agreed on;" for the BISHOP of EXETER (in his Sermon before the Society for the propagation of the Gospel, 1785) has exhibited an explanation of this prophecy totally different. His Lordship supposes, "that the prophet, when he says that "the glory of the latter house shall be greater than the glory of the "former, does not intend to make any comparison between the material temples, whatever pretensions each of them may have had; "but is carried on by the spirit of prophecy to take a view of greater and more distant objects, and to compare in the usual language "and figurative style of oriental eloquence, the dispensation of religion which was to take place in the kingdom of the Messiah, "with that which had been established by Moses." Should this interpretation appear to any one ill grounded, it is nevertheless urged with so much candor, good sense, and sobriety, not without a plausibility of argument at least, that on these accounts, as well as in regard to the rank and character of its Author, it is justly intitled to a temperate and respectful discussion. For my part, I shall not descend to particulars, but shall content myself with offering an observation or two, which in my opinion militate strongly and equally against any allegorical interpretation of this prophecy. In the first place I am persuaded, that where the literal sense is natural and consistent, and qualified with a reasonable share of dignified importance (as I trust it will here appear to be) there is no sufficient ground, nor is it safe, to quit the plain and direct path, in order to search for mystical meanings in the mazes of allegory. Secondly, Where Allegory is intended, and there is danger of misapprehending the

words literally, some note of discrimination may justly be expected, in order to point out the figurative application. When the Messiah is prophesied of as "a foundation or corner stone;" *Iſai* xxviii. 16. when Christians are said to be "built upon the foundation of the" "apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner" "stone, in whom all the building fitly framed together, groweth" "unto an holy temple in the Lord." *Ephes.* ii. 20, 21. in these and such like instances referred to, the design is so plain and manifest from the context, or from the impossibility of a literal acceptation of the terms, that there is no likelihood of its being mistaken. But when our Saviour standing in the temple, and being asked for a sign of the authority by which he acted in vindication of the sacredness of the house, replied, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will" "raise it up;" *John* ii. 19. the Jews were necessarily deceived (as it was probably meant they should be) and every one else that heard or read those words must have been at a loss too, had it not immediately followed, "But he spake of the temple of his body." In like manner, if while the people were actually employed in rebuilding the temple, and the prophet was encouraging them to go on vigorously with the work, he had meant under the term "this house" to speak of any other than the material temple, of an allegorical edifice, "a house not made with hands," would the discovery of this intention have been left to mere casual conjecture, without the least mark of distinction to justify such a deflexion from the ordinary rules of interpretation? And the same observation will hold also with respect to the passage in *Zechariah*, Ch. vi. 12—15. which the Bishop has cited as parallel to this of *Haggai*, but which, in my opinion, is also to be understood literally, although the terms made use of may be (whether designedly or not, God knows) applicable to persons and things belonging to *latter days*.

[B] DR. HEBERDEN thinks it "probable that the second" "temple was in no respect inferior to the first, except in the" "want

"want of the ark and the shechinah"; that is, it was at least equal in external splendor and magnificence. To judge of the probability, it will be proper to consider the sums expended on the first temple. If the silver and gold, which David said he had prepared for the house of the Lord, be taken according as the account now stands in the Hebrew text, 1 Chro. xxii. 14. the amount would be 825 millions of pounds sterling^b. A larger sum perhaps than was ever expended on any other single building. But admit a mistake in the numerals, and take the tenth part only, according to Josephus, (Antiq. l. vii. c. xiv.) who here at least seems not disposed to exaggerate, and add the other sums of gold and silver said to be given by David and his subjects over and above the preceding, 1 Chron. xxix. 3, 4, 7. and the whole will still amount to near 130 millions of pounds sterling, the gold and silver only. To these must still be added the value of the jewels and precious stones which David had prepared, and which his subjects gave, all that were found with them; of the brass and of the iron, which are described to be without weight and number; of the timber and marble and other stones for building, which also are said to have been provided in abundance; and, which perhaps may have exceeded all the rest, what Solomon himself may be supposed to have given according to his father's exhortations, and his own immense wealth and princely spirit; and upon the most moderate calculation the whole expence cannot be rated at so little as 200 millions of pounds sterling. — On the other hand, the vessels of gold and silver restored by Cyrus, though a valuable present, were in comparison of the above estimate as nothing; the value of the presents made by Artaxerxes and his courtiers, as well as by the Jews themselves, according to the weight set down Ezra viii. 26, 27. will amount to about 800, 000 £, or a little more; let those two articles be set at two millions of pounds sterling (which I think

^a Bp. Newcome on the Minor Prophets, Note [a] p. 171.

^b See Brerewood's *Traſſatus de ponderibus et pretiis veterum nummorum*, prefixed to Walton's Polyglott, p. 32.

will be a large allowance) and substracted; and can it be supposed from any authentic representation we have of the circumstances of the Jews between the building of the temple and the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, who plundered it, that they could have supplied a sum equivalent to the remainder? Nor does it appear from any thing said in the account of the plundering of the temple by that prince, that he found any thing like such a treasure in it. But if it was not so rich and splendid at that time, there is still less likelihood of its having become so afterwards before Herod's time, who, as we shall see in the next note, expressly declares it to have been otherwise.

[C] Joseph. Ant. Lib. xv. Cap. xi. Τον γὰρ ναὸν τέλει ὡκοδομήσαν μὲν τῷ μεγίστῳ Θεῷ πατέρες ἡμετέροι μετὰ τὴν ἐκ Βαβυλωνος ἀναγασθῆναι. Ἐνδεὶς δ' αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸ μέγεθος εἰς ὑψὺς ἑξήκοντα πηχεῖς· τὸ σῶτον γὰρ ὑπερέχεν ὁ πρῶτος ἐκεῖνος ὃν Σολομὼν ἀνακόδομησε. Καὶ μηδεὶς ἀμελείαν εὐσεβείας τῶν πατέρων καταγνώτω· γέγονε γὰρ ἔπαρ' ἐκείνους ἙΛΑΤΤΩΝ ὁ ναὸς· ἀλλὰ ταῦτα καὶ Κύρος καὶ Δαρεῖος ὁ Ὑσαπὲς τὰ μέτρα τῆς δομῆσεως ἔδωκαν, οἱ ἐκεῖνοι καὶ τοῖς ἀπογούνοις δαλευσάντες, καὶ μετ' ἐκείνων Μακεδόσιν, καὶ ἔχον εὐκαιρίαν τὸ πρῶτον τῆς εὐσεβείας ἀρχεῖσθαι εἰς ταῦτον ἀναγαγεῖν μέγεθος. Ἐπειδὴ δὲ νῦν ἐγὼ μὲν ἀρχὴ Θεὸς βεβλήσκει, πῆρις δὲ καὶ μῆκος εἰρήνης, καὶ κτήσις χρημάτων, καὶ μέγεθος προσόδων, τὸ δὲ μέγιστον, φίλοι καὶ δι' εὐνοίας οἱ πάντων (ὡς ἔπος εἰπείν) κρατύνει Ρωμαῖοι, πείρασομαι, τὸ παρημελημένον ἀναγκὴ καὶ δόλῃα τὰ πρότερον χρόνῳ διορθέμενος, τελειὰν ἀποδόναι τῷ Θεῷ τὴν ἀνδ' ὧν εὐτυχόν τῆςδε τῆς βασιλείας εὐσεβείαν.

“ This temple was built for the service of the supreme God by our
 “ forefathers after their return from Babylon. But in respect to size
 “ it was deficient sixty cubits in height, for so much was it exceeded
 “ by that former one which Solomon built. Nor let any one blame
 “ our fathers for want of pious exertion; since it was not their
 “ fault that the temple was less. But both Cyrus and Darius Hytaspes
 “ prescribed these measures for the building; to whom and to
 “ their descendants they being in subjection, as they were afterwards
 “ to the Macedonians, had it not in their power to renew the first
 “ plan of piety on the same scale of magnitude as before (literally,
 “ to bring back the first plan of piety to the same magnitude.) But since

“ I

" I now reign by the will of God, and have over and above the ad-
 " vantage of a long peace, a great deal of ready money also, and a
 " large revenue, and, what is above all, am secure of the friend-
 " ship and goodwill of the Romans, who are (as I may say) sove-
 " reign Lords of the universe, I will endeavour, by rectifying
 " whatever has been left imperfect through the necessity and servi-
 " tude of former times, to render the devotion of this kingdom
 " complete, in return to God for the blessings I have received."

I cannot help noticing, that from this speech there is little reason
 to conclude that the second temple was either three times, or even
 double the breadth of Solomon's; as it must have been, if it had
 been sixty cubits broad, as stated Ezra vi. 3. since the first tem-
 ple was only twenty cubits in breadth, or with the side chambers
 thirty at the most. Would Herod have said, that our fathers were
 hindered from carrying the plan of their building to its original
 magnitude, if the Persians instead of curbing had really enlarged
 the measures of it one way, as much as they had lessened them an-
 other? Nor does it seem likely that the Jews at that time would have
 sought such an enlargement, but would have been content, if their
 circumstances would have enabled them to execute a plan which had
 been found sufficient in their most flourishing times. But the truth
 seems to have been, that Cyrus had it in view to prevent the tem-
 ple's being made use of as a fortress, which by its strength might
 tempt the people some time or other to rebel; he therefore limited
 the height, but left the length and breadth as before; both which were
 probably expressed in the original decree. For it may be, that a tran-
 scriber having written פתיה אמין, his eye may have glanced over עסרין
 ואורכיה to another אמין, which he thinking to be the same as he
 had before set down wrote שתין after it, omitting the intermediate
 words עסרין ואורכיה אמין. Josephus indeed gives the decree ex-
 actly as it now stands in Ezra; but the mutilated copy may have
 been established before his time. This however I throw out merely
 as matter of conjecture.

[D] *Ανελών δὲ τὰς ἀρχαίας θεμελίους, καὶ καταβαλόμενος ἑτέρας, ἐπ' αὐτῶν τὸν ναὸν ἠγάγε, μήκει μὲν ἑκατὸν οὐκὰ πηχῶν, τὸ δ' ὕψος εἰκοσὶ περὶ τοῖς, καὶ τῷ χρόνῳ συνιζήσαντων τῶν θεμελιῶν ὑπέβη. "Taking away the old foundations, and laying new ones, he built the temple upon them, in length an hundred cubits, and in height the same, and twenty more, which last twenty it sunk afterwards, the foundations having given way." Joseph. Antiq. Lib. xv. Cap. xi.*

[E] The following character which Josephus gives of Herod Ant. lib. xvii. c. viii. is not very flattering to the memory of his supposed hero. *Ἄνθρωπος μὲν εἰς πάντας ομοῖως, καὶ ἀρχῆς μὲν ἡσῶν, κρείσσων δὲ τῷ δικαίῳ, τύχη δὲ εἰ καὶ τις ἕτερος κεχρημένος ευμένει. ἐκ τῆ γὰρ ἰδιότητος βασιλεὺς καταστάς, καὶ κινδύνοις μυρίοις περιττειχίζομενος, πάντων ποιεῖται διαδρασίην, καὶ τῆ ζῆν ἐπὶ μακρίστον ἔχετο. ὅσα δὲ ταῦ κατ' οἶκον, περὶ τοῖς αὐτοῖς, ὅσα μὲν γυνάμνη τῇ ἐκείνῃ, καὶ τύχη πάντων δεξία κεχρημένος, διὰ τὸ κρείσσων ἐχθρὸς κρατεῖν οὐκ ὑπερῆσται, δοκεῖ δὲ μοι καὶ πάντων δυστυχῆς. "A man ferocious in his manners alike towards*
" all, of ungovernable passion, devoid of all regard for justice; but
" a favourite of fortune, if any man ever was. For having been
" raised to a throne from a private station, and surrounded with num-
" berless dangers, he fairly escaped them all, and died at a very ad-
" vanced age. As to his domestic concerns, respecting his sons, ac-
" cording to his own opinion, he was in high good luck, for such
" he deemed the not having failed to get the better of his enemies;
" but in my judgment, he was altogether the reverse."

[F] It appears from Josephus (Ant. l. xvii. c. viii. De B. J. l. i. c. xxxiii.) that Herod's reign was differently computed, from the time when he was declared King by the Romans, and from the death of Antigonus, which happened three years after; so that in the one case he is reckoned to have reigned 37 years, in the other 34. This serves to reconcile two passages of the same historian, in one of which he is said to have begun his building of the temple in the 18th year of his reign, and in the other to have executed what he did there in the 15th year of his reign (Ant. l. xv. c. xi. De B. J. l. i. c. xxi.) Deduct 18 from 37, or 15 from 34, and the remain-
 der

der will be 19, the number of years which passed between the commencement of the work and the death of Herod. Herod is by some supposed to have died near a year, by others near two years, after the birth of Christ. And our Saviour is said (Luke iii. 23.) to have been about thirty years of age when he began his public ministry; that is, he was either turned of 29, or of 30 Years. So that according as we take one or two years from 29, or from 30, we shall have 27, 28, or 29, for the years which passed from the death of Herod to the time when our Saviour met the Jews in the temple. Taking the medium, which is 28, and adding to 19, we shall have just 47 years since the temple was begun; and from that time workmen had been continually employed upon it, and long after, as appears from Joseph. Antiq. l. xx. c. ix. The Jews therefore might well say that their temple had been forty and six years in building, speaking exclusively of the current year.

[G] Μεγαλη εστι η δεξα τε ουκ εστι, η εχατη υπερ την πρωτην. That our own translators did not disapprove of this mode of translation is evident from Ruth iii. 10. where they have rendered מִן חַרְאֲשׁוֹן הַיָּטֶבֶת הַסֹּדֶךְ הָאַחֲרֹן מִן חַרְאֲשׁוֹן — “Thou hast shewed MORE kindness IN THE LATTER END THAN AT THE BEGINNING.” The Greek uniformly as before — *Ηγαθυνας το ελεος σου το εχαλον υπερ το πρωτον.*

[H] I must here take leave to add what I had in some degree overlooked before, though it seems of great weight in deciding the matter in question. In the two verses preceding the text, God, in order to encourage the people to proceed vigorously with the building, repeatedly assures them of his continued presence among them. “Yet now be strong, O Zerubbabel, saith the LORD, and “be strong, O Joshua, son of Josedeck, the high priest, and be “strong, all ye people of the land, saith the LORD, and work; FOR “I AM WITH YOU, saith the LORD of hosts. According to the word “that I covenanted with you when ye came out of Egypt, so MY “SPIRIT REMAINETH AMONG YOU; fear ye not.” If we turn to “Exod.

Exod. xxix. 45. we shall find the word of promise alluded to —
 “ And I will dwell among the children of Israel, and will be their
 God.” But it is also to be observed, that in the same Chapter, ver. 42,
 43. God had just before spoken of his “ meeting with the children
 “ of Israel in the tabernacle, and of its being sanctified with his
 “ glory ;” which undoubtedly must mean the cloud of glory, the
 symbol of his presence, which filled first the tabernacle, Exod. xii.
 34. as it afterwards did the temple of Solomon. But as it was na-
 tural enough, when this glory was withdrawn, for the people to
 doubt whether God’s presence was with them as formerly ; therefore,
 after he had once assured them that he was still with them, he adds
 again by way of confirmation, “ my spirit remaineth among you :
 “ fear ye not.” As if he had said, “ Though ye no longer see the
 “ manifestation of my glory among you, as in the former temple,
 “ yet do not fear that I have forsaken you ; for I am still spiritually
 “ present as much as ever, and the influence of my power is at hand
 “ for your guard and protection.” Then follows with much pro-
 priety, “ Yet once again, after a little time, ye shall see a visible ma-
 “ nifestation of my glory in my temple, when he who is the desire
 “ of all nations shall come ; and the glory he shall bring with him
 “ shall be greater than ever filled the temple before ; and moreover
 “ instead of gold and silver, which I could give if I would, I will
 “ give a much greater blessing, I will give peace.”

F I N I S.

